

WRITTEN OPINION
OF THE INTERNATIONAL
SEARCHING AUTHORITY
(SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET)

International reference
PCT/EP2005/050360

IAP6 Rec'd PCT/PTO 25 JUL 2006.

Box V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

Reference will be made to the following document:

D1: US 2003/070070 A1 (YEAGER WILLIAM J ET AL) 10 April 2003 (2003-04-10)

Document D1 (*cf.* in particular the passages cited in the Search Report) discloses, according to all features of claim 1, a circuit arrangement (for example peer 200B, Fig. 2B) for securing communication between network subscribers belonging to a peer-to-peer network (for example peer group 210A, Fig. 2B), comprising a network module for communicating with further network subscribers and external communications devices that do not belong to the peer-to-peer network (for example peer 200D, Fig. 2B), a crypto module for handling cryptographic functions (for example computer system 180, Fig. 3, paragraph 0057 to paragraph 0063; paragraph 0106 to paragraph 0108), a memory module comprising a first memory sub-module in which association features relating to a first network subscriber are stored (for example codat 500, Fig. 4; Fig. 5A; paragraph 0066 to paragraph 0072), wherein a second memory module is provided, with the second memory module comprising memory sub-modules for buffering certificates of further network subscribers and it being possible for the certificates of the further network subscribers to be requested by all other network subscribers in each case (for example Fig. 10; Fig. 10B; paragraph 0109 to paragraph 0116; paragraph 0122 to paragraph 0126).

All features of claim 1 are therefore known from document D1.

The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore not novel (Article 33(2) PCT).

Even if claim 1 were to be amended such that there were no more objections with regard to novelty, it would not be inventive with respect to the prior art (Article 33(3)

PCT) as document D1 discloses the same object (a circuit arrangement for securing communication of network subscribers) and the same solution (storing the certificates as a resource in the P2P network) as the present application.

Independent claim 4 is an illustration of claim 1 using method steps which correspond to the device features of claim 1. The above statements on the obviousness of the subject-matter of claim 1 therefore apply accordingly to claim 4.

The subject-matter of claim 4 is therefore not novel (Article 33(2) PCT) and is therefore not based on an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

Dependent claims 2, 3 and 5 do not contain any features which, combined with the features of any claim to which they relate, satisfy the requirements of the PCT with regard to novelty or inventive step. See document D1 and the corresponding passages cited in the Search Report.